DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 437 CS 010 960

AUTHOR Barry, Martha H.; And Others
TITLE A Survey of Reading Approaches.
PUB DATE 21 Apr 92
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Questionnaires; *Reading Instruction; Reading Research; *Reading Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Whole Language Approach
IDENTIFIERS Success in Reading and Writing Program

ABSTRACT

A study examined the reading approaches used by teachers and how accurately the teachers described the approaches to reading they purported to use. Subjects, 206 teachers in 19 elementary schools from 9 schools districts in a southeastern state, completed a questionnaire. Results indicated that (1) 68.75% of the teachers cited the basal as their primary means of teaching reading, 14.28% reported using the skills approach, 8.93% cited the "Success in Reading and Writing" approach, 2.68% cited the whole language approach, and 5.36% cited an eclectic approach; (2) overall, 70.37% of the respondents accurately described the central characteristics of the approaches to reading instruction they purported to follow; (3) all teachers citing the skills approach, 96% of the teachers using basals, 91% of the teachers using the Success in Reading and Writing, and 50% of the teachers using the whole language approach accurately described their respective approaches to reading instruction; and (4) the teachers valued oral reading, writing in response to reading, and sustained silent reading. (The questionnaire, cover letter to principals, a list of the definitions of the approaches to reading instruction, and 19 references are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346437

A SURVEY OF READING APPROACHES

Martha H. Barry, Ph.D.
Darlington County Schools
Darlington, SC 29532

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Linda Randolph
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Susan Moskow, Ed.D.
University of South Carolina - Salkehatchie
Allendale, SC 29810

Michaeleen P. Peck, Ph.D.
Lexington School District Five
Irmo, SC 29063

Linda C. Randolph, Ph.D.
University of South Carolina - Aiken
Aiken, SC 29801

authorship reflects a collaborative effort by all

American Educational Research Association
San Francisco Hilton
April 21, 1992
Session 18.28
Tuesday
2:15 - 3:45

CS010960

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Survey of Reading Approaches

Reading instruction at the elementary level has been dominated by the basal reader for decades. As Chall and Squire (1991) note, in the United States basal reading programs with their array of accompanying materials, are used in more than 95% of all school districts through grade 6. Flood and Lapp (1986) would increase that percentage. These researchers estimated that 98% of all teachers in the U.S. use basal series. Apparently, the proliferation of varied reading programs and practices in the 1980's and 1990's has not resulted in any substantial movement away from basal readers. Indeed, Barksdale-Ladd, Thomas and Jones (1990) report that teachers are using the recently published basal reading programs of the 1990's more extensively than they have used basal programs in the past. In fact, the basal reading programs still remain a highly influential factor in reading education despite the criticisms these programs have received from educators (Thomas, Barksdale-Ladd & Jones, 1991).

The public's concern for accountability throughout the 1970's and 1980's emphasized a skill based approach to reading instruction. Children were prepared for taking standardized or minimum competency tests within basal reading programs (Chall & Squire, 1991). Findings from A Nation at Risk (1983) and interpretations of NAEP assessments led to the perception that educational standards had declined drastically, especially in the areas of "fundamentals" such as reading. As a goal of schooling, reading instruction became regarded as one of the "basic skills" and instruction was guided by state and district mandated curricula which reflected objectives necessary to pass the prescribed tests. In addition, increasing numbers of minorities and children from low socioeconomic groups appeared to perform poorly on reading tests. To ameliorate this situation, special reading programs were designed by commercial companies or school districts and often implemented within the prescribed basic skills framework.

During the 1980's there was a popularization of Whole Language, Success in Reading and Writing (1978), and literature-based reading instruction. The programs emphasized an increased commitment to writing, utilization of children's literature, and

opportunities for sustained silent reading (Bergeron, 1990; Harste, et al., 1988; Success, 1978). Although basal reading programs continued to prevail, more quality children's literature has been incorporated into basal texts (Chall & Squire, 1991; Farr, 1988).

An analysis concerning the continued preeminence of the basal and skill based approach during a time when Whole Language, Success and literature-based reading programs are receiving approval from educators, school districts and some state education departments (eg. see California State Department, 1987) is complex and must be drawn from a variety of sources. Basal reading and skill based programs have provided a highly articulated framework for reading teachers to follow (Chall & Squire, 1991). In fact, critics of basal readers claim that these programs are so pervasive that there is a danger of deskilling teachers (Shannon, 1989) and of removing necessary decision-making by the teacher (Duffy, Roehler & Reinsmoen, 1983).

Whole Language, unlike the basal reading programs, is an idea which encompasses a philosophy of language development along with instructional approaches or strategies which support and are embedded within that philosophy (Bergeron, 1990). Thus whole language would necessarily require teachers to create their own frameworks within the context of the classroom environment. Reflective teaching and decision making which grow out of the purposes for whole language are individual and grounded in a philosophy which acknowledges the importance of children's growth and development (Harste, et al., 1988). Whole Language teachers, then, are architects who collaborate with their students to develop and build authentic reading and writing experiences within the parameters of a Whole Language philosophy.

Success in Reading and Writing (1978), like Whole Language, integrates reading and writing within the language arts. While the teacher's editions do provide a format for instruction through modules, there is flexibility. Teachers are instructional decision-makers and must incorporate reading, writing, spelling and language within the suggested two hour language arts block. No worksheets or readers are provided in Success. As in Whole Language classrooms, children are heterogeneously grouped. An underlying assumption of Success is that children are literacy users and should be engaged in authentic language experiences. Success, then, does provide some direction for teachers through brief modules, but the preponderance of planning and instruction are clearly the teacher's domain.

The approaches or movements discussed represent a continuum of practices derived from a range of theories. The skills approach, representing a behaviorist perspective, might fall at

one end of the continuum while the Whole Language Movement, which embodies a constructionist orientation, would be positioned at the other end. The basal reading program, if strictly implemented, appears to be removed from the constructionist view. On the other hand, Success in Reading and Writing (1978) would seem to be closer to the constructionist position or Whole Language philosophy.

Obviously, any teacher who attempts the journey from a skills or basal approach toward a Whole Language philosophy will be confronted with risks and false starts, and must engage in reflective teaching and self-questioning. Provisions for the trip should be provided prior to embarking. The trip is more difficult, at this time, as there is no clear articulation, or map to guide the classroom teacher through Whole Language. Schools can aid in these preparations. Since teachers must form their own constructs about reading and instructional practices within the philosophy or beliefs inherent in Whole Language and to a lesser extent in Success, time is essential. Unencumbered time for reading, self-reflection, and collaboration with other professionals is required to develop an understanding of Whole Language or Success. As Duffy (1990) has suggested, substantive instructional change will not result from traditional short-term staff development programs. If change is to occur, schools and districts must commit financial resources and long-term staff development programs consistent with promoting and supporting individual professional thought as opposed to simply following the practices implicitly or explicitly given in a skills approach manual or the teacher's edition of a basal. Movement along a continuum, then, from approaches with highly specified practices given in manuals to the adaptive, thoughtful, problem solving practices associated with Whole Language, Success or literature-based approaches demands real change.

Because of the multiple pressures exerted on school districts and teachers to modify their reading instruction, one might expect to see changes in classroom reading instruction. This study was conducted in a state which has experienced significant changes in education during the last ten years. Such changes have had the potential for impacting upon reading instruction. There is a state mandated testing program for reading, writing, math and science. The components of the program include the test, objectives, suggested activities, and mandated remediation. In contrast, present trends in the state's initiatives as they apply to reading have taken the form of encouraging an integrated curricula that include all of the language arts. In addition, the state is progressing toward the creation of authentic assessments to replace older testing programs which emphasized basic skills.

Just as curriculum and instruction tend to be driven by mandated assessments in the past, so it may be the case today. In the particular state under study, some school districts are

advocating practices which reflect trends consistent with the state's efforts to revise curriculum and assessments in reading. For example, some districts offer free courses in the Integrated Teaching of Reading and Writing (Success in Reading and Writing), openly advocate the Whole Language Movement, or offer extensive staff development in these or other forms of literature-based instruction.

Whether or not any of these trends are being translated into classroom practice is an issue requiring further examination. A related concern involves determining whether teachers can accurately describe their professed approach(es) to the teaching of reading. Hook and Rosenshine (1979) reviewed literature related to teacher's observed practices and their reports of their behaviors and beliefs. Findings revealed a low correlation between self-reports and observer ratings of teacher's specific behaviors. Another startling finding reported in a summary of the 1988 NAEP study of fourth graders and fourth grade teachers stated that one-third of the teachers in the sample did not know how their students learned to read ("Learning to Read," 1991). Whether or not teachers continue their current instructional practices or begin to move toward more innovative approaches or movements in reading instruction, a recognition of what one is currently doing would seem to be important for effective instruction and professional development. Such identification is in part self-referential and reflective. Certainly, the issue of articulating or identifying accurately one's instructional practices is critical if genuine change is to occur.

An ancillary item worthy of investigation is the extent to which literacy events are incorporated into reading instruction. Literacy events as defined here are taken to mean the degree to which teachers read children's literature to students, the inclusion of writing after teacher's oral reading, and the extent to which sustained silent reading is used in the classroom. These acceptable practices are often associated with Whole Language, Success and literature-based instruction (Adams, 1978; Bergeron, 1990; Harste et al., 1988). The 1988 NAEP results for fourth grade showed that according to teachers only 13 percent of the students in the sample write each day about what they read ("Learning to Read," 1991). Reading aloud to students each day was a standard practice reported by 57 percent of teachers. These processes or techniques are stressed by the new approaches or movements mentioned above. Therefore, they may be expected to appear with greater frequency in classroom where teachers describe themselves as using Whole Language or Success.

Three questions guided this descriptive study:

a) What is the distribution of reading approaches used by the teachers surveyed?

b) How accurately do teachers describe the approach(es) to reading they purport to use?

c) To what extent are literacy events incorporated into reading instruction?

METHOD

Survey questionnaires were sent to principals of 42 elementary schools representing 19 school districts within one southeastern state during the spring of 1991. A cover letter was sent to the principal with the questionnaires (see appendix). The cover letter requested that surveys be disseminated to teachers (K-8) who teach reading/and or language arts for any part of the day. Further, a request was made that the survey be given during a faculty meeting. No follow-up measures were employed to increase the rate of return.

The questionnaire was an extension and a refinement from Ratliff & Buss (1990). (A copy of the questionnaire is included in the appendix.) Procedures for analyzing the questionnaires, including precise definitions of approaches to reading, were established and reviewed by the four researchers. Definitions were obtained from established sources, were thoroughly discussed, and a list of definitions was created (see appendix).

Data in the present study represent returned responses from 206 teachers in nineteen elementary schools from 9 districts. Responses were received from 19 of the 42 schools (45%) and represented 9 of the 19 districts (47%). Participating schools are characterized by 5 schools being predominately black, 8 white, and 6 balanced (SCDE, 1991b). Three schools are classified urban, 1 mixed, and 15 rural (SCDE, 1991a). Of the districts responding to the survey, one is the largest geographic school district in the state and several are among the smallest geographically and in enrollments.

A tabulation table was constructed to provide for compiling data in a useful form. Raters were to copy data from the original surveys onto the tabulation table. On the survey only one item required a decision by the rater. The item requiring a decision involved determining whether or not a teacher's description of their reading instruction matched the teacher's professed approach to reading. Raters compared the teacher's description with the definitions. The raters considered the description and approach to match if the description was within the parameters of the definition. Any discrepancy was assessed as a nonmatch. The interrater reliability resulting from all raters indicated

that there was a high degree of consistency (100%).

Data would be analyzed in the following manner: number of teachers following a specific approach to reading; number of teachers for each approach to reading who could accurately describe that approach based on previously agreed upon definitions; number of teachers who read aloud to children 5 or more times per week; number of teachers who read aloud for at least 10 minutes per session; number of teachers who had children write in response to oral reading always, occasionally, almost never, never; number of teachers who used sustained silent reading, number of teachers who engaged in sustained silent reading 5 or more times per week. Percentages were then calculated from the numbers.

Thus the primary area of interpretation concerned evaluating the match between respondents' self-ascribed approach(es) to reading instruction and the set of practices they described themselves as following. Ancillary items reviewed concerned the duration and frequency of literacy events in the classroom. These events are defined as teachers reading orally to students, the incorporation of writing after such oral readings, and the infusion of SSR into the reading program.

After the questionnaires were returned, nine were randomly selected from the total set. The researchers independently tabulated responses according to the procedures previously defined. Researchers met and found themselves to be 100% in agreement. Researchers then divided the remaining surveys and completed the tabulation process.

RESULTS

Of the 206 respondents, 17 did not give any description of their reading approaches(es). Regarding the remaining 189, the data indicate that 70.37% of respondents were able to accurately describe the central characteristics of the approach(es) to reading instruction they purported to follow. The remaining 29.63% were not able to accurately describe those characteristics.

Since teachers who can not accurately describe their approach would seem not to know their approach, data on approaches used is reported only for those 133 teachers who correctly described and labeled the approaches(es) to reading they implemented. With regard to reading approaches used overall, 68.75% of the teachers cited the basal as their primary means of teaching reading. The remaining teachers reported utilizing skills (14.28%), Success (8.93%), Whole Language (2.68%), and eclectic (5.36%) approaches.

Further examination of the original 189 teachers who gave descriptions of their reading approach(es) showed that teachers

purporting to use a skills approach or eclectic approach had the highest degree of accuracy in describing their approach (100%). Also with a high degree of accuracy were teachers reporting a basal approach (96%) and Success in Reading and Writing (91%). In contrast, those teachers purporting to use whole language were found to be correct in their description of that approach only 50% of the time.

Literacy events were judged on the basis of total responses given to each item regardless of the relation between the identified and self-reported practices used in reading instruction. These literacy events were: teacher's oral reading to children, duration of oral reading sessions, writing in response to oral reading, and frequency and duration of sustained silent reading.

From the 189 respondents, 183 addressed the question concerning teacher's oral reading to children. There were 113 (61.75%) who reported reading 5 or more times per week. With regard to the duration of oral reading sessions, 178 teachers responded to this item. Of these, 173 (97.19%) teachers read to students for at least 10 minutes per session.

Only data from the 173 teachers who read to students for at least 10 minutes per session were analyzed for response to the writing questions. Those teachers responding to questions about writing in response to oral reading by the teacher totaled 148. Data related to frequencies of writing indicated that 65.54% used writing occasionally, 27.03% never used writing, 6.76% always used writing, and 0.68% almost never used writing in response to oral reading by the teacher.

It was possible to analyze sustained silent reading (SSR) as a literacy event in 149 teacher's classrooms. Since this item involved length and duration, responses such as 'yes', 'daily', 'if possible', 'seldom', 'as time permits' could not be tallied. Percentages for the frequency of SSR were: 55.03% reported utilization of SSR 5 or more times per week, 5.37% reported 3 - 4 times per week, and 39.6% reported 3 or fewer sessions per week. The length of each SSR session was said to exceed ten minutes by 95.9% of those responding to the SSR question.

DISCUSSION

As might be expected, the more established behavioral approaches to reading, basal and skills approaches are easier to understand and to articulate. As a consequence, the basal approach (96%) and the skills (100%) approach are more accurately described by practitioners than the relative new-comers on the block.

Similarly, teachers who reported using Success in Reading and Writing (91%) were highly accurate in their description. One reason for this might be the Success commercial materials which

serve the same function as the teacher's edition in a basal series by providing structure and guidance. A conceptual framework including instructional modules are published in the Success texts. In addition, Success in Reading and Writing has received some support across the state. Colleges, universities, and school districts have offered tuition free classes to teachers and a few elementary school administrators advocate or go so far as to require primary grade teachers to use Success to teach reading. Thus published materials, institutional support for and administrative prerogatives in favor of Success may contribute to teachers' knowledge of the program and their consequent ability to describe what they claim to use as their primary approach to the teaching of reading.

Unlike the groups above, teachers who claim to use whole language were far less able to describe their purported means of teaching reading (50%). Whole Language is a philosophy, not a method or program. Therefore it is difficult to provide a clearly articulated conceptual framework. This has resulted in a lack of published materials and accompanying assessment instruments, lack of administrative support, and a popularization of the term without a clear understanding of the underlying tenets.

Because the Whole Language philosophy is constructive, holistic, and child centered by virtue of the very nature of the philosophy it is deemed difficult, if not impossible and inappropriate, to design explicit materials to guide teachers' instructions. Rather the philosophy relies on the teachers internalization of the concepts underlying holistic reading instruction and child development. Such internalization is not quickly or easily acquired. Rather the necessary understandings must be acquired through experience, intensive staff development/courses, complex cognitive effort, time for introspection and reflection, and adequate time for instructional planning and development.

Lack of administrative support may reflect a lack of acceptance on the part of the establishment. This may be due to a reluctance to embrace a philosophy which does not include explicit guidelines for the teacher and appropriate quantifiable assessment instruments. Innovation in education institutions requires much support in terms of staff development, course offerings, or administrative approval. Less exposure to and an absence of administrative support for the Whole Language Movement may contribute to teachers' inability to correctly identify characteristics of Whole Language.

Although Whole Language is a celebrated term among educators in the state, it is unclear that classroom practitioners understand the dimensions of the Whole Language Movement. Indeed, the popularization of the term 'Whole Language' and its relative newness may account for teachers inaccurate descriptions. Some

teachers purported to use Whole Language but described the basal approach. This later group may provide evidence of the effect of the new "buzz" word on teacher talk. We often can talk about something before we actually put it into practice or fully understand it.

Although reading educators who practice a skills approach account for only a small percentage of the group under discussion (14.28%), the reliance on such an approach may be explained by the state's historical emphasis on basic skills. State policy, then, as translated by some school districts, may affect the reading approach teachers say they use. Once again, administrative mandates appear to play a role in the appearance of the skills approach in the data.

In fact all of the teachers who purported to use a skills approach could accurately describe a skills approach. It is of interest that these teachers all teach in the same school district. Two of the teachers described a Distar Reading Program while the majority of the teachers described a district developed and mandated skills curriculum called Basic Skills Instructional Management System (BSIMS). BSIMS involves the teaching of five skills in isolation. These skills are main idea, decoding, inference, details, and analysis of literature. These skills match on a direct one-to-one correspondence with the state mandated basic skills teaching and testing of reading objectives. There is a heavy reliance on worksheets to teach the skills. It is of further interest that some of these teachers seem to have a preferred approach at variance with the approach they are required to implement. In fact, most of these teachers spend time reading aloud, writing in response to reading, and sustained silent reading. These statements are evidenced by the following anecdotal remarks.

> We use the BSIMS curriculum, which makes it difficult to use basal readers and workbooks. We use a spiral approach and lots of worksheets. If it isn't tested, it isn't taught. There is no room in the schedule to use different approaches, materials, or ideas. It is stifling and dull.
>
> "Do you orally read children's literature in your classroom?" I do not feel the required curriculum allows time for this, but I do feel it is essential. (Teacher reported reading aloud twice per week for five minutes.)

Another aspect of reading instruction concerns the use of literacy events. Literacy events as defined in this study include: teacher's oral reading to children, duration of oral

reading sessions, writing in response to oral reading, and frequency and duration of sustained silent reading. Data from this study indicate these literacy events were utilized by the vast majority of teachers surveyed. Regardless of the instructional approach used, teachers agree and make time for what has become commonly accepted appropriate literacy events.

Despite the pressures and demands of state testing and prescribed curricula, practitioners are enriching their reading curriculum with sound literacy based instructional practices. It may be lamented that only 61.75% of the teachers surveyed in this study are reading children's literature to their students. But is must also be celebrated that over half the teachers are including such readings even though 68.75% are still using a basal approach to instruction. This would indicate that the emphasis on children's literature found in, for example, Whole Language or literacy based movements, is having an impact on other modes of reading instruction.

Findings directed to the incorporation of writing in response to the teacher's oral reading demonstrated that teachers are attempting to integrate at least two areas of the language arts. This movement toward integrated instruction by a majority of teachers represents a promising effort and a departure from teaching reading in isolation.

It must also be noted that 55% of classrooms represented are using Sustained Silent Reading on a daily basis. Increases in this figure would be expected as Whole Language, Success and literacy-based approaches gain acceptance institutionally in school districts.

The study reported here illuminated a shift in instructional practices within the schools surveyed within one Southeastern state. Further research will be required to discern the strength of emerging trends. The changes in state level and district level requirements may influence the approaches to reading. It may be equally important to design staff development programs and curricula which expose teachers and administrators to approaches or movements which go beyond the basal.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings in the present study concerning approaches employed overall are somewhat surprising. With respect to using the basal approach, teachers' practices are not consistent with their colleagues across the U.S., that is, they do not rely on the basal as extensively in teaching reading as others have found (Chall & Squire, 1991; Barksdale-Ladd, Thomas & Jones, 1990; Flood & Lapp, 1986). While teachers responding to the questionnaire who gave this approach and correctly described it represent a majority, the percentage of teachers citing the

basal approach as their primary means of teaching reading was only 68.75%. With the advent of new basals as well as new methods and programs, research involving other states may find the percentage is no longer as high as 95% or 96%. This may well represent an emerging trend of teachers as professionals who no longer need to be dominated by the basal to construct and present a reading lesson or more importantly the entire reading curricula.

Teachers purporting to utilize a Whole Language approach could correctly describe such an approach 50% of the time. In contrast, teachers purporting to follow the Success approach could accurately describe this approach 91% of the time. This is not surprising in light of the unstructured philosophy of Whole Language in contrast to the structured framework of Success. The teacher's edition for Success provides teachers with the outline for lessons to be developed with the children. The school districts involved in this study provide extensive staff development in the philosophy, method, and materials for Success before and during implementation. If it is important to design staff development programs and curricula which expose teachers and administrators to approaches or movements which go beyond the basal, it may be as equally important to provide time to construct the framework for the new program/curricula or to provide the framework as the Success program has done.

Of interest is the wide-spread utilization of various literacy events by all teachers regardless of their approach. Teachers in this study appear to value, and thereby make time for, oral reading, writing in response to reading, and sustained silent reading. These findings support similar findings on a national basis ("Learning to Read," 1991). Research turned into practice appears to have inculcated these practices on all teachers no matter the professed approach to the teaching of reading.

Teachers in this study could articulate their professed approach to the teaching of reading with a high degree of accuracy (basals 96%, skills 100%, Success 91%). However, this study is limited by the self-reporting survey methodology which was employed. It would be of interest to further explore this topic with observations of the teachers followed by structured interviews. This would serve to further illuminate teachers' approaches to reading and their understanding of their selected approach.

Grade Level_____ School_____
Subject_____

1. What is your primary approach to teaching reading? (check one)

_____ basal which basal?_____

_____ whole language

_____ language experience

_____ individualized

_____ Success in Reading

_____ eclectic (please explain)

_____ other (please explain)

2. For how long have you followed this approach? _____

Briefly describe a typical day's reading activities.

3. Name three children's books you use or know of. List the author's name if possible.

4. Name three children's books you use or know of written in the past five years.

5. Name a children's book you use or know of in each of the following areas:

fiction-

biography-

poetry-

fantasy/science fiction-

picture book-

mystery/adventure-

historical fiction-

multi-ethnic-

6. Name three or more activities which promote recreational reading on the part of children.

7. What resources (other teachers, conference, print source, in-service) do you use to identify children's books?

8. Do you incorporate Sustained Silent Reading in your classroom reading program?_____

If yes: how often (number of times per week)?_____

average length of each SSR session (minutes)?_____

what do you do during Sustained Silent Reading?_____

9. Do you orally read children's literature in your classroom?

If yes: how often (number of times per week)?_____

average length of oral reading session (minutes)?_____

Following oral reading, I do: (check all that apply)_____

a. _____discussion

_____always _____on occasion

b. _____question-answer

_____always _____on occasion

c. _____writing activity

_____always _____on occasion

d. _____other (please list)

how often?_____

e. _____none of the above

10. Do you guide students selection of recreational reading materials?_____

If yes, how?

11. Do you engage in personal recreational reading?_____

If yes: how much time on average per week is spent reading?

What types of materials do you select for your personal reading? Check all that apply.

_____ newspapers

_____ magazines

_____ books (please list type preferred-mystery, science fiction, novels, biography, etc.)

_____ other (please list)

12. Do you engage in literature discussions? _____

If yes, with whom? _____ colleagues at school

_____ family members

_____ friends

How often? _____ once per month

_____ once per week

_____ once per day

_____ other (please specify)

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SALKEHATCHIE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

P.O. Box 617
Allendale, SC 29810
(803) 584-3446
FAX 584-5038

P.O. Box 1337
Walterboro, SC 29488
(803) 549-6314
FAX 549-6007

April 16, 1991

Dear Principal:

I am writing to request your help with a project I am working on with several other researchers. We are interested in determining the amount and kinds of knowledge teachers have concerning children's literature. To gather some information about this knowledge, we would like to survey your teachers. The survey is designed for elementary teachers who teach reading and/or language arts for any part of the day. I am asking that you give out this survey to teachers during a faculty meeting and ask them to fill it out and return it to you immediately. This would greatly increase our response rate as I am sure you know.
All survey information will be confidential. Results will be reported as aggragate data and no individual school or teacher will be identified.
Research such as this helps us determine the kinds and levels of knowledge our teachers have. The implications for planning staff development programs are obvious. We will plan to share our findings with you if you so desire.

Thank you for your willingness to help with this project.

Sincerely,

Susan P. Moskow

Susan P. Moskow. Ed.D.
Assistant Professor

The University of South Carolina: USC Aiken; USC Salkehatchie, Allendale; USC Beaufort; USC Columbia; Coastal Carolina College, Conway; USC Lancaster; USC Spartanburg; USC Sumter; USC Union; and the Military Campus.

Appendix C

Definition of Terms

The terms listed below represent approaches to reading or constructs essential to the clarification of the study.

BASAL -- An approach combining ability leveled student texts with selections to be read, workbooks with exercises, and a teacher's edition with extensive teaching directions and suggestions. Lessons follow a pattern of introduction, vocabulary, reading, discussion, skills development, enrichment, and evaluation. (Duffy & Roehler, 1986, p. 87).

WHOLE LANGUAGE -- Students learn to read and write in environments that encourage communication through the integration of reading, writing, listening and speaking. Central to the approach is the idea that this integration should be organized around good literature. (Barr & Johnson, 1991, pp. 5, 8). Children acquire literacy in the same way that they acquire oral language, naturally and over time through extensive and varied exposure to authentic literacy tasks. Separate instruction in reading or language arts should not occur. The teacher is the facilitator, not the expert; students define tasks and materials themselves. (Knapp & Shields, 1990, pp. 46-48.).

LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE -- In this approach, reading is taught in close correlation with the related activities of listening, speaking, and writing. Children express thoughts, ideas and feelings, often in response to specific experiences guided and developed by the teacher. Reading, writing, listening and speaking skills are integrated. Language experience is often used in conjunction with Basal and individualized instruction, usually in lower grades. (Harris & Sipay, 1985, p. 66).

INDIVIDUALIZED -- Emphasizes the self-selection by children of the library books they wish to read and the words they wish to learn. Students read independently and the teacher instructs through individual conferences. During these conferences, the teacher and student discuss the books currently being read, the teacher assesses student needs and achievements and provides individualized instruction. This approach is usually used in middle and upper grades. (Duffy & Roehler, 1986, pp. 91-93).

SUCCESS IN READING -- An organizational format for integrating reading and writing in language arts instruction. No dittos or worksheets are to be employed. Students read and write, teachers do wholegroup and one-on-one instruction. More time is spent teaching, less correcting student work. Students are encouraged to learn and practice without limitations of ability grouping or graded materials. (Flyer from Goodyear Books).

ECLECTIC -- Some combination of three or more of the above approaches.

Bibliography

Adams, A. (1978) Success in beginning reading and writing: The basal concept of the future. Santa Monica, CA.: Goodyear.

Barksdale-Ladd, M.A., Thomas, K.F. & Jones, R. (1990, December). The basals of the 90's: Toward teacher empowerment? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, Fl.

Barr, R. & Johnson, B. (1991). Teaching reading in the elementary classroom: Developing independent readers. White Plains, New York: Longman.

Bergeron, B. (1990). What does the term whole language mean? Constructing a definition from the literature. Journal of Reading Behavior, 22, 301-329.

California State Department of Education (1987). Handbook for planning an effective literature program: Kindergarten through grade twelve. Sacramento: Author.

Chall, J.S. & Squire, J.R. (1991). The publishing industry and textbooks. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of Reading Research: Vol. 2 (pp. 120-146). White Plains, New York: Longman.

Duffy, G.G. (1990, November) What counts in teacher education? Dilemmas in educating empowered teachers. Paper presented at the fortieth annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, Fl.

Duffy, G.G. & Roehler, L.R. (1986). Improving classroom instruction: A decision-making approach (p.87; 91-93). New York: Random House.

Duffy, G.G., Roehler, L. & Reinsmoen, T. (Eds.) (1983). Comprehension instruction: Perspectives and suggestions. New York: Longman.

Farr, R. (1988). The changing basal reader. Educational Leadership, 45, 86.

Flood, J. & Lapp, D. (1986). The match between what students read in basals and what they encounter in tests. Reading Research Quarterly, 21, 284-297.

Harris, A.J. & Sipay, E.R. (1985). How to increase your reading ability (8th ed.). White Plains, New York: Longmans.

Harste, J.C., Short, K.G., Burke, C., Kauffman, G., Revel-Wood, M., Robinson, S., Rowe, D.W. Woods, M.L. & Woodward, V. (1988). Creating classrooms for authors: The reading-writing connection. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books.

Hook, C.M. & Rosenshine, B.V. (1979). Accuracy of teacher reports of their classroom behavior. Review of Educational Research, 49, 1-12.

Knapp, M.S. & Shields, R.M. (19). Better schooling for the children of poverty: Alternatives to conventional wisdom.

Shannon, P. (1989). Broken promises: Reading instruction in twentieth century America. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

South Carolina State Department of Education (1991a). Pupils in South Carolina Schools 1990-91. Columbia, South Carolina: South Carolina State Department of Education.

South Carolina State Department of Education (1991b). Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina 1989-90. Columbia, South Carolina: South Carolina State Department of Education.

Thomas, K.F., Barksdale-Ladd, M.A. & Jones, R.A.(1991). Basals, teacher power, and empowerment: A conceptual framework. In J. Zutell & S. McCormick (Eds.), Fortieth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Learner factors/teacher factors: Issues in literacy and instruction (pp. 385-397). Chicago: National Reading Conference, Inc.